

REMARKS

It has been indicated in the current Office action that Applicants' previous arguments assertedly necessitated the new grounds of rejection, and therefore this action is made final. All the previously outstanding objections to and rejections of Applicants' disclosure and claims not contained in the current action have been withdrawn by the Office. At present, claims 1-4, 6-12 and 15-30 are pending.

As for the prior art rejections, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 12, 17, 19, 20, 22-24 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Akahori (US Publication No. 2005/0012705; "Akahori"). Furthermore, claims 3, 7, 8, 18, 21, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being assertedly unpatentable over Akahori. Claims 9-11 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being assertedly unpatentable over Akahori in view of Kim (US Publication No. 6,300,928; "Kim").

Applicants have most respectfully considered the remarks addressed in this Office action. In response thereto, Applicants respectfully traverse all the rejections stated in the action based on at least the following grounds. Reconsideration of the instant application is most earnestly solicited.

Discussion of Office Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 12, 17, 19, 20, 22-24 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Akahori. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons given below.

Independent claim 1 recites the features as follows:

“A serial-protocol panel display system, suitable for use in a panel display apparatus, comprising:

a pixel-array unit;

a plurality of gate drivers and source drivers, used for driving the pixel-array unit to display image; and

a video graphic adapter (VGA) unit, according to a serial protocol, to **export a serial-protocol image display signal** and a clock signal **to a corresponding one of the gate drivers** and one of the source drivers,

wherein the gate and source drivers respectively decode the serial-protocol image display signal, so as to obtain a plurality of input signals, and to drive pixels of the pixel-array unit **and the serial-protocol image display signal is at least one of red or green or blue pair signal.**” (Emphasis added)

The Office Action holds that [t]he applicant has failed to limit “to export a serial protocol display signal” sufficiently to overcome the applied art (Final Office Action, page 11, lines 7-8). Response to the Office Action mentioned above, the Applicant has amended claim 1. Applicant submits that the amended claim 1 has limited the serial-protocol image display signal to be at least one of red or green or blue pair signal. That is, the video graphic adaptor exports at least one of red or green or blue pair signal

and a clock signal to the gate drivers. Applicant designates that Akahori only discloses the controller exports the SDC signals to the source driver 101 and supply a scan horizontal sync signal and the like to the gate driver 102. (Paragraph [0029], last four lines). The scan horizontal sync signal and the like disclosed by Akahori are all control signals and different from the **“red or green or blue pair signal”**.

Furthermore, a person skilled in the art always knows that the **red, green and blue pair signals** are standard VGA adaptor output signals. In the teaching of Akahori, the red, green and blue pair signals must be feed into the LCD controller 103. LCD controller 103 decodes the red, green and blue pair signals to the scan horizontal sync signal and the like. Applicant submit that, in claim 1 of present application, the gate drivers receive at least one of the red or green or blue pair signal and generates the scan signal similar to the scan horizontal sync signal. That is, in present application, the LCD controller such as Akahori taught is integrated into both the source drivers and the gate drivers. The LCD controller is not necessary in present application.

Accordingly, Akahori fails to teach, disclose or suggest the amended claim 1. The rejection of the amended claim 1 of present application should be withdrawn.

For the same reason discussed above, Akahori fails to teach the amended independent claims 15, 17 and 19, inasmuch as at least the technical features of **“export a serial-protocol image display signal to a corresponding one of the gate drivers, and the serial-protocol image display signal is at least one of red or green or blue pair signal.”**

Because independent claims 1, 15, 17 and 19 are allowable over the prior art of record, its dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 6, 12, 20, 22-24 and 30 are allowable as a matter of law, for at least the reason that these dependent claims contain all features/elements/steps

of their respective independent claim 1. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Discussion of Office Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a)

Claims 3, 7, 8, 18, 21, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being assertedly unpatentable over Akahori. Claims 9-11 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being assertedly unpatentable over Akahori in view of Kim.

In light of the foregoing arguments, Akahori and the combination of Akahori in view of Kim fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, inasmuch as at least the technical features of “**export a serial-protocol image display signal to a corresponding one of the gate drivers, and the serial-protocol image display signal is at least one of red or green or blue pair signal**” set forth in independent claims 1 and 19 of the present invention are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art of record, taken alone or in combination.

Since claims 9-11 and 27-29 depends upon the allowable claims 1 and 19 which patently define over the combination of Akahori and Kim also fails to cure the deficiencies contained in Akahori view of Kim, the 103 rejection of claims 9-11 and 27-29 relying upon the combination of Akahori and Kim should also be rendered withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-4, 6-12 and 15-30 are in proper condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date :

Respectfully submitted,

Nov. 28, 2008

Belinda Lee
Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw
Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw